

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11-17, 19-20, and 22-23 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 8, and 15 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 is amended to now recite “determining a relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view, the deviation of the cursor from a center of the displayed part of the virtual view being proportional to the deviation of the displayed part from an origin of the virtual view”, and “the step of changing includes moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view on the display, the another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location”. Support for these limitations is found in original claims 4 and 7.

Independent claim 1 is also amended so that the step of “displaying only a part of a virtual view on a display of an electronic device, the virtual view comprising an entire spatially arranged data set in which a user of the electronic device navigates” is moved from the preamble to the body of the claim.

Independent claim 8 is amended to now recite “means for moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location in response to movement of the cursor to the desired location”, and “a browse lock being switchable between an on state and an off state, the displayed part being maintained static when the browse lock is in the off state, the means for moving including the browse lock and the

view control means". Support for these limitations is found in original claim 10 and page 6, lines 21-27 of the application as originally filed.

Independent claim 15 is amended to include limitations similar to the amended limitations of independent claim 1.

Claims 4, 7, 10, 18, and 21 are canceled.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 9, 11-14, 16-17, and 19-20 are amended for consistency with the changes to independent claims 1, 8, and 15 and to place the claims in proper format according to US patent practice.

Claims 22-23 are added to separate the alternative claim language in original claims 2 and 9.

Objections to Claims 8-10

Claims 8-10 were objected to because these claims included reference numerals, and have now been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the objection to claims 8-10 should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,602,566 (Motosyuku) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,124,374 (Haken).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Motosyuku and Haken and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,368 (Fager).

Claims 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Motosyuku in view of Haken.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Motosyuku and Haken and further in view of Fager.

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Motosyuku in view of Haken.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Motosyuku and Haken and further in view of Fager.

Independent claim 1 now recites “determining a relation between the cursor location on the display and the location of the displayed part of the virtual view within the whole virtual view so that the cursor location on the display reflects the location of the displayed part of the virtual view in proportion to the whole virtual view, the deviation of the cursor from a center of the displayed part of the virtual view being proportional to the deviation of the displayed part from an origin of the virtual view”, and “the step of changing includes moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view on the display, the another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location”.

The combined teachings of Motosyuku and Haken fail to teach or suggest the above limitations.

Motosyuku discloses an information processor capable of scrolling in response to tilting the device. According to Motosyuku, a display unit 106 reads out one frame of display data 202 (see col. 3, lines 17-19; and Fig. 2 of Motosyuku). Also disclosed by Motosyuku is a switch 110 which maintains a command for scrolling when depressed (col. 3, lines 32-35). A tilt sensor 104 is read and the display is scrolled through the display data 22 in response to the tilt angle when the switch 110 is “ON” (col. 3, lines 8-53).

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Motosyuku fails to disclose a cursor.

The Examiner alleges that Haken discloses the claimed cursor. Haken relates to a graphical interface control system for a computer. According to Haken, a computer 10 includes a

sensor which allows a computer to be aware of a relative direction from the display screen to each of separate processor devices connected to the computer, e.g., a docked PDA, a digital camera, a laptop computer, a scanner, a mobile phone, a television, or a VCR (see col. 2, lines 29-35 and 63-65 of Haken). During operation, the user moves a mouse or other input device to move a cursor 102 on the display screen 12 to select one of the processor devices (col. 3, lines 16-21). If the cursor is moved to an edge area associated with one of the devices, the input signal from the mouse is transferred to that device (col. 3, lines 40-45). Thus, according to Haken, the cursor can be moved from the computer screen 12 to the screen of one of the devices (see col. 3, lines 45-55).

Since Haken discloses that the cursor moves from the computer screen to one of screens of the adjacent devices, Haken fails to disclose that the screen on the computer display 12 changes to a different part of a virtual view. Accordingly, Haken fails to disclose, teach or suggest “the step of changing includes moving the cursor to a desired location and displaying another part of the virtual view on the display, which another part corresponds to the desired location”, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

Thus, the combined teachings of Motosyuku and Hakem fail to teach or suggest the above limitations of independent claim 1.

Fager fails to teach that which Motosyuku and Hakem lack. Fager relates to control equipment with a movable control member. The position and orientation of the control member 1 is determined based on signals it receives from signal sources $M_1, M_2, M_3 \dots M_n$ (col. 6, lines 25-40 of Fager). Movement of the controller is used to control a control element such as a robot (col. 9, lines 60-62). Fager does disclose that the controlled equipment may be a cursor on a computer display. However, Fager fails to disclose anything about changing a displayed portion. Accordingly, Fager fails to disclose “the step of changing includes moving the cursor to a desired location and

displaying another part of the virtual view on the display, the another part of the virtual view corresponding to the desired location”, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.


Accordingly, independent claim 1 is also allowable over Motosyuku and Hakem in view of Fager.

Independent claims 8 and 15 include limitations that are similar to the above limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 8 and 15 should be allowable for the same reasons as is independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5-6, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-20, and 22-23 are allowable for at least the same reasons as are independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By 
Alfred W. Froeblich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: November 7, 2007